DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 301 SO 014 628

AUTHOR	Clay, Thomas
TITLE	Music in Ohio Schools. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Ohio Music Education Association, Oxford.
PUB DATE	Feb 82
NOTE	43p.; Appendix A and B may not reproduce clearly due to small print type.
AVAILABLE FROM	239 Center for Performing Arts, Miami University, Oxford, OH (free, while supply lasts).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Class Size; Disabilities; Discipline Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; Financial Support; *Music Education; Professional Associations; Program Budgeting; Public Support; School Desegregation; School Support; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Salaries; Teaching (Occupation); Teaching Conditions; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS	*Ohio

ABSTRACT

To determine facts and opinions concerning the status of music in all Ohio schools (public and private), questionnaires were sent to the 4,389 K-12 teachers listed in the 1981 Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) Directory and survey instruments were mailed to superintendents of each of Ohio's 614 school districts. Approximately 47.5% of the teachers and 49% of the superintendents responded. Conclusions are that: (1) a relatively small proportion of teacher music positions have been lost during the past several years; (2) quality of music programs was generally high for teachers and administrators, (3) nearly 90% of the teachers found music to be a fulfilling profession, and (4) student interest, attitude, and achievement are the most encouraging aspects of the profession for 40% of the teachers. Respondents also believed that school districts have failed to provide adequate funding for music programs. One fourth of the teachers think the OMEA should become a political force and lobby the legislature for money. The questionnaire and survey instrument are provided in the appendices. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229301

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas H. Clay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MUSIC IN OHIO SCHOOLS

Final Report

Ohio Music Education Association

Stuart J. Ling, President

Committee on Research

James Scholten, Chair

Ad Hoc Committee for the Project

Jeri Forsythe
Richard Mountford
Linda Wachtel, ex officio
Thomas Clay, Chair

Report Prepared by

Thomas Clay

SP 014 628

Oxford, Ohio
February, 1982

FORWORD

Sincere thanks are in order to the many persons who have contributed to the completion of this project: to the Ad Hoc Committee and Linda Wachtel for aid in the development of the survey instruments, to Ray Kley for the development and execution of a pilot study, to the students of the Miami University Department of Music and students of Stewart Junior High School, Oxford, for much help with assembly and mailing processes, to Graduate Assistant Gary Powell for aid in processing raw data, to Khadijeh (Shala) Hamidzadeh of the Miami University Academic Computer Services for aid in the processing of information, to Everett Nelson for editorial help, to Margery Markowich for typing service and manuscript editing, and last, possibly most important, to the many teachers and administrators who cooperated with this project by completing and returning the survey instruments.

T.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I, MUSIC TEACHER SURVEY

A. Factual Data 2

B. Opinion Data 10

SECTION II, SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY

A. Factual Data 21

B. Opinions 27

SECTION III, CONCLUSIONS 29

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

I	DISTRIBUTION OF EXPECTED RESPONSE AND ACTUAL RESPONSE	2
II	TEACHING EXPERIENCE BY YEARS	3
III	AREA OF SPECIALIZATION OF RESPONDENT GROUP	3
IV	NUMBER OF CLASSES MET PER WEEK BY CHORAL, INSTRUMENTAL, AND GENERAL MUSIC TEACHERS	4
V	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS MET PER WEEK BY RESPONDENT GROUP	5
VI	NUMBER OF STUDENTS MET PER WEEK BY CHORAL, INSTRUMENTAL, AND GENERAL MUSIC TEACHERS	6
VII	NUMBER AND SIZE OF PERFORMANCE GROUPS WITHIN PAST FIVE YEARS	7
VIII	TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND MUSIC TEACHER CHANGE WITHIN PAST FIVE YEARS	8
IX	EXISTENCE, USE, AND DEVELOPMENT OF APPROVED COURSES OF STUDY	9
X	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS OF "GOODNESS OF" AND FUTURE OF THE PROFESSION BY THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND TWO SELECTED SUBGROUPS	11
XI	POSITIVE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING DISCIPLINE AS IT AFFECTS MUSIC TEACHERS	13
XII	ASPECTS OF ENCOURAGEMENT IN THE MUSIC TEACHING PROFESSION	17
XIII	ASPECTS OF DISCOURAGEMENT IN THE MUSIC TEACHING PROFESSION	18
XIV	REQUESTS FOR OMEA HELP FOR SCHOOL MUSIC PROGRAMS	19
XV	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND BOARD OF EDUCATION DOLLARS ALLOCATED FOR MUSIC PROGRAMS, 1980-81	25
XVI	OMEA SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY REASONS FOR TEACHER LOSS IN THE YEARS, 1976-81	26

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MUSIC IN OHIO SCHOOLS

MUSIC IN OHIO SCHOOLS is a two-part study conducted under the auspices of the Ohio Music Education Association for the purpose of determining the status of music in Ohio schools in terms of the following factors: 1) factual data and opinions regarding the nature of music programs as perceived/understood by teachers, and 2) factual data and opinions regarding the nature of music programs as perceived/understood by school district administration. The study was delegated to the Research Committee of the OMEA,[1] which created an Ad Hoc committee for the conduct of the research.

The first phase of the project was the development and administration of a pilot study for the particular purpose of generating viable questions for teachers, and for the additional purpose of determining the feasibility of conducting such a study on a state-wide basis. The pilot was conducted in Southwest Ohio and was based on a random sample of all teachers in that particular region.[2] Using the results of the pilot in addition to other sources of information, the committee eventually developed two survey instruments for the project: the first, a music teacher questionnaire,[3] was sent to the 4389 elementary and secondary teachers listed in the 1981 "OMEA Directory," inclusive of all teachers in all schools in the State; the second survey instrument[4] was mailed to the superintendent of each of the 614 school districts in Ohio. Of the 4389 questionnaires sent to music teachers 266 were returned by the postal service, being undeliverable; as a consequence, there was a total of 4123 valid survey instruments in the music teacher study. There were 1960 responses from teachers, approximately 47.5% of the total. Of the 614 surveys mailed to school districts 301 were returned, approximately 49%. Following repeated mailings to one particular local school district which were returned as undeliverable, the writer declined to pursue the issue further, although that system is a functioning district.

---

[1] The Research Committee is chaired by Dr. James Scholten, Ohio University. Members of the Ad Hoc committee are Dr. Jeri Forsythe, Ohio State University, Dr. Richard Mountford, Malone College, and Dr. Thomas Clay, Miami University, Chair. Aid in the preparation of the survey instruments was also provided by Dr. Linda Wachtel, Music Consultant, Ohio Department of Education. Execution, analysis, and reporting for the study has been under the direction of Thomas Clay.

[2] The pilot study was completed in 1980 as a graduate project by Raymond Kley, doctoral candidate at Miami University.

[3] The complete survey will be found in Appendix A.

[4] The complete survey will be found in Appendix B.

SECTION I, MUSIC TEACHER SURVEY

A. Factual Data

Teacher respondents to the survey were from each of Ohio's 88 counties, from urban, suburban, and rural communities, and from each type of school in Ohio: city, exempted village, local, Christian, parochial, and private. As would be expected the most populous counties provided the greatest number of responses, Cuyahoga leading the response with nearly 10% of the total; several counties, however, were represented with only one response.[5] As to the type of community suburban schools represented nearly 43% of the response, while rural districts provided 32% and urban about 24% of the total. As there is no specific state-wide definition of the requirements for the three categories of communities, these figures must be accepted on their own merit as the best available information according to the opinions of the respondents.

Also, as would be expected, city and local school districts represented, by a huge majority, the greatest response by district type; the two combined for nearly 88% of the total; exempted villages provided about 6.5% of the response, while Christian, parochial, and private schools responded with about 5.5% of the total. Although the following data regarding response may be valuable only in a general sense, it is one means of comparing survey response to state-wide distribution of public school districts; this information is not totally representative due to the fact that 5.5% of the survey response came from non-public schools. However, as shown in TABLE I below, city school districts comprise about 30% of the state, exempted villages about 8%, and local districts about 61.4%; response, however, was 52% from cities, 6.4% from villages, and about 36% from local districts, and, as noted, about 5.5% from non-public schools. The figures indicate that city district respondents exceeded their distribution expectation by approximately 20% and local district respondents were nearly 25% below their expectation (discounting the effects of the non-public 5.5%).

TABLE I

OMEA TEACHER SURVEY DISTRIBUTION OF EXPECTED RESPONSE AND ACTUAL RESPONSE

	Total State	Actual Response
City	30.6%[6]	52.2%
Exempted village	8%	6.4%
Local	61.4%	35.7%
Non-public	not incl.	5.5%

[5] For the interested reader percentages of response for each OMEA District and OMEA Region are listed in APPENDIX C.

[6] Data from the Ohio Educational Directory 1980-81, (Columbus, Ohio, State Board of Education)

Among the teacher respondents 60% hold the bachelor's degree, 39% the master's, while the remainder hold the PhD, the associate, or, in the case of three teachers, no degree at all. Years of teaching experience spans a continuum of 62 first year teachers to two persons who profess to have 45 years in the profession. The mode, slightly greater than 7.5%, was represented by third year teachers. Teachers in the first ten years of experience represented greater than 54% of the total; by the twentieth year 82% was reached, and by the twenty-fifth year 91% of the total was reached. By inference, then, it would seem that there are most likely fewer than 350 music teachers in Ohio who have been in the profession for more than twenty-five years. TABLE II below indicates percentages of survey response according to years of teaching experience in grouped data.

TABLE II

TEACHING EXPERIENCE BY YEARS

Years	Percentage
1- 5	30.1%
6-10	24.6
11-20	28.2
21 +	17.1

N = 1926

While many of the respondents reported teaching at all levels, i.e., elementary, middle, junior and senior high school, it was those teachers in elementary and middle schools exclusively who represented nearly 37% of the sample. High school teachers made up about 12%, junior high teachers nearly 7.5%, while the remainder of the sample consisted of persons who teach in multiple levels.

Regarding the survey question which asked for the area of specialization of the respondent there was a total of 56 different areas identified; in the process of analyzing the data it was determined that general/choral teachers comprised about 50% of the respondent group, instrumental teachers about 37%, general/vocal/instrumental teachers about 11%, and supervisors/classroom teachers/counselors comprised about 1% of the total as noted in TABLE III following.

TABLE III

AREA OF SPECIALIZATION OF RESPONDENT GROUP

Type	Percentage
General/choral	50.4%
Instrumental	37.6 (band-34.1; orch.-3.5)
General/vocal/instrumental	11
Supervisor/counselor/classroom	1

N = 1920

While it may seem that, for some, a music teacher's professional life resembles that of an itinerant gypsy, statistics indicate that nearly 42% of the respondents teach in only one school building; an additional 31% of the respondents teach in two buildings, while only 12% teach in three buildings, 7.5% in four, 3.5% in five, and 2.5% in six school buildings. Thus, nearly three-fourths of the teachers work in no more than two buildings. One unfortunate individual, however, indicated that he teaches in fourteen different school buildings (he is certainly entitled to the itinerant medal)!

Regarding the issue of the number of classes met per week by the teacher respondents, three categories were used in order to gain a statistical report of the number of classes according to the nature of the classes. Because of the division of respondents into the three categories noted above, and because of the multiplicity of variables, some data was lost for persons reporting multi-areas of teaching; for this particular issue choral teachers comprised 10% of the sample, instrumental was 30%, and general teachers 60% of the sample. TABLE IV below gives an analysis of the number of classes met per week by the various groups of teachers. The smallest number of classes noted was eight per week by an instrumental teacher, while the largest was seventy-seven by a general teacher.

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF CLASSES MET PER WEEK BY CHORAL, INSTRUMENTAL, AND GENERAL MUSIC TEACHERS

Number of classes	Choral	Instrumental	General
10 or fewer	19.0%	20.0%	9.2%
11 to 20	13.5	18.0	11.0
21 to 30	52.5	34.0	29.2
31 to 40	10.0	19.0	34.5
41 to 50	3.0	7.0	14.0
51 to 60	1.0	1.5	1.6
61 or more	1.0	.5	.6
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	N=162	N=490	N=982

In so far as the total number of students met per week the range was from zero to an appalling 3300, very possibly a suspect figure (it would require a teacher to meet, for example, an average of 55 students in 60 classes each week, in order to achieve such a figure). There were, however, 22 teachers who reported meeting from 1500 to 2400 students each week in music classes. At the opposite end of the spectrum there were nine teachers who reported that they meet 25 or fewer students per week. In order to gain a perspective of the total number of students met per week by the respondents, TABLE V following indicates numbers of students met in grouped form, the percentage within a given group, and the cumulative percentage from zero to the largest number within a given group.

TABLE V

TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS MET PER WEEK BY RESPONDENT GROUP

Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-100	7.5	7.5
101-200	23.9	31.4
201-300	14.4	45.9
301-400	8.8	54.7
401-500	10.7	64
501-600	7.3	71.3
601-700	6.9	78.3
701-800	6.5	84.8
801-900	4.1	88.9
901-1000	4	92.9
1001-1250	4.1	97.2
1251-1500	1.5	98.8
1501-1750	.5	99.3
1751-2000	.2	99.6
2001 +	.4	100.0

N = 1862

Another way of examining the number of students met each week is to return to the categorical division used above, i.e., choral, instrumental, and general; this manner of analysis may well be more meaningful in that any teacher can readily identify the particular rank in which he/she fits in terms of student load. TABLE VI below gives percentage figures for each of the three teaching-area groups; for this particular analysis the smallest figure was 18 while the largest was 3300.

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF STUDENTS MET PER WEEK BY CHORAL, INSTRUMENTAL AND GENERAL MUSIC TEACHERS

Number of students	Choral	Instrumental	General
0-60	10.9%	9.3%	8.8%
61-120	13.6	18.8	3.0
121-180	14.3	25.9	7.2
181-240	16.3	17.5	9.1
241-300	2.7	6.5	4.6
301-400	5.4	3.6	7.8
401-500	5.4	3.0	13.0
501-600	8.2	4.5	13.0
601-700	6.1	3.0	11.5
701-800	6.1	3.0	12.3
801-1000	4.8	3.4	6.0
1001-1500	4.1	1.5	2.0
1501-2000	2.0	0	1.3
2001 +	0	0	.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	N= 157	N= 480	N= 938

Although three general music teachers reported an average class size of one student, the mode for this statistic was 25 students, with 30 students being a close second; in fact, 65% of all responses were within these numbers; an additional 13% of responses were between 20 and 24, and 8% were between 31 and 35. The remaining 14% was spread somewhat evenly between 1 and 19 and between 36 and 70.

In keeping with the statistic noted supra regarding the number of classes met during a school week, it is not surprising that 5% of the general music teachers reported no planning during a school day. Possibly with tongue in cheek an additional 2% reported fewer than ten minutes per day for planning. The largest group, twenty percent, reported 30 minutes per day for planning time. An additional 36% reported planning time from forty to forty-five minutes; nearly 15% reported from 50 minutes to one hour in planning time, while the next largest group, approximately 6%, reported only 20 minutes planning time. The remaining 15% of the respondents reported somewhat disparate times up to a total of three and one-half hours, a seemingly suspect figure for any general music teacher.

TABLES VII and VIII following illustrate several interesting statistics in that, while the number and size of performance groups has increased by a sizeable percentage within the past five years, both total school enrollment and the number of music teachers has declined in the same period of time. The decline in total school enrollment is reasonably drastic in that nearly 68% of school districts have lost students while only about 16% have gained in enrollment. Also, while 28% of the districts have lost music teachers, approximately 43% have experienced no change and nearly 20% have increased the number of teachers in the field.

TABLE VII

NUMBER AND SIZE OF PERFORMANCE GROUPS WITHIN PAST FIVE YEARS

	Number of Groups	Size of Groups
Increase	39.5*	51.3
Decrease	11.3	21.5
No change	42.3	18.8
Do not know	7	8.4

* Percentage figures

TABLE VIII

TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND MUSIC TEACHER CHANGE
WITHIN PAST FIVE YEARS

	Enrollment	Number of Music Teachers
Increased	15.9%	19.6%
Decreased	68.6	28.4
No change	7	43.4
Do not know	8.5	8.6

It would seem that, while school enrollment has decreased in a rather significant number of schools within the past five years, the relative loss of music teachers has provided a net gain, in a state-wide analysis at least, of the teacher-pupil ratio.

The survey questions regarding budget for music programs as provided by boards of education were apparently misunderstood or unpopular in that 951 persons, nearly half the total sample, declined to respond. Of those who did respond more than 20% reported zero budget; the reported figures are greatly disparate, ranging from $1.00 to as much as $26,000. It is worth noting that 22% of the respondents have received increases in budget within the past five years while 33% have experienced decreases in budget in the same period; finally, 60% of the respondents indicated that budgets are inadequate, while 40% reported satisfaction with the budget.

While 81% of the sample reportedly have a boosters organization for music, only 35% reported receiving any monies from such an organization within the past year. Monies received indicated no particular pattern, and ranged from a low of $10.00 to a high figure of $40,000.

Table IX below provides comparative statistics regarding the existence, use, and development of an approved course of study for music. Approximately 6% of the sample declined to respond to these questions, however, statistics indicate that there are such courses in about three-fourths of the schools of respondents, and, that they are used in nearly two-thirds of those schools.

TABLE IX

EXISTENCE, USE, AND DEVELOPMENT OF APPROVED COURSES OF STUDY

	Course of Study Existence	Regular Use	Respondent Develop
Yes	75.5*	64	61
No	24.5*	36	39

* Percentage figures

It would seem apparent that the term, Educational Service Personnel Program is unfamiliar to the majority of music teachers in the sample in that 52% indicated no knowledge of the existence of such a program. Conversely, of the remaining 48%, only 16% indicated that such a program currently exists in their school districts.

The penultimate factual statistic is that 87.5% of the respondents reported that all music classes are taught by music specialists. And finally, 77% of the respondent sample reported membership in the Ohio Music Education Association.

Of the approximate 1350 OMEA members responding to the survey, 23% were from urban communities, 44% were from the suburbs, and 33% were from rural areas; these percentages almost exactly parallel the total survey distribution in terms of community type.[7]

Finally, years of teaching experience of OMEA members closely parallel that of the total respondent group.[8] I-5 years, 31%; 6-10 years, 22.4%; 11-20, 28%; and 21 plus years experience, 19%. The only significant change is the drop, by about three percentage points, of the six to ten year group.

---

[7] See percentages of community response, supra, p. 2.

[8] See TABLE II, p. 3.

B. Opinion Data

Response from the opinion section of the teacher survey seemed to be reasonably consistent in terms of questions within the same genre. There were, however, a number of questions, as will be noted, which received a rather substantial percentage of response in the "no opinion/not applicable" category, questions which would seem to not lend themselves to such a response. The average failure to respond in this entire section of questions was approximately 2.5%.

Although the questions were printed in the original survey instrument based on a random sample, they are reported here grouped according to the particular nature of the questions.

The first series of questions from the survey reported here pertain to the "goodness of" and the future of the profession, including questions numbered 1, 4, 7, 8, 25, and 27; they are reported as follow:

Question	Response[9]		
	Agree	No Opin.	Disagree
I believe that music is as basic to general education as the "three r's".	95%[10]	.4%	4.5%
I am encouraged about the future of music education in Ohio schools.	30.7	15	54.5
I am encouraged about the future of my music program.	62	7	31
I am considering leaving the profession of music education.	29.6	15.8	54.6
Teaching music is a fulfilling profession for me.	86.8	3.9	9.2
If I were choosing a profession again today, I would still choose to become a music teacher.	59.6	9.5	30.9

[9] For purposes of this report the Likert scale response inventory has been reduced to a single positive and a single negative response; the neutral category remains as in the original.

[10] These are percentage responses; they will not always equal one-hundred percent due to the rounding of figures.

As it seems to the writer that the foregoing set of questions represents, perhaps, the most critical issue in the survey, further categorization and analysis of the set of questions has been completed and is reported below in TABLE X. In order to achieve a more realistic comparison of positive and negative response of those who answered the questions, the neutral category has been deleted. Further, responses have been analyzed according to three different criteria: 1) the total sample, 2) urban, suburban and rural teachers, and 3) 1-5 year teachers, 6-10 year teachers, 11-20 year teachers, and 21 plus year teachers. Next, coefficients have been derived for the latter two groups of respondents; they are reported only if they exceeded .90 probability. Three did not exceed .90, but rather were from .50 to .77, and consequently, are not reported here. Finally, a reliability coefficient was computed for the entire set of questions; the derived coefficient was .77.

TABLE X

POSITIVE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS OF "GOODNESS OF" AND FUTURE OF THE PROFESSION BY THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND TWO SELECTED SUBGROUPS

Questions	Percentage figures of positive response							
	Total sample	Urban	Suburban	Rural	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-20 years	21+ years
I believe that music is as basic to general education as the "three r's".	95	94	96.5	95	96.5	93.5	95.8	97.5
I am encouraged about the future of music education in Ohio schools.	35.9	33.2	36.7	36.7	39	33	35	36.4
I am encouraged about the future of my music program.	66	61.7	66.8	71.3	71.8	67	65.7	62
I am considering leaving the profession of music education.	35.5	33.6	35	37.7	34.3	37.7	33.9	35.9
Teaching music is a fulfilling profession for me.	89.8	89.6	90	89	88.7	87.7	93.7	92
If I were choosing a profession again today, I would still choose to become a music teacher.	65	62.5	65.5	67	68.4	62.7	64.4	68.3

The second area of opinions was grouped into the classification: support by various groups for music programs. Included in this section are survey questions 2, 12, 14, 17, and 21, with a derived reliability coefficient of .77. This set of questions is reported as follows:

Question	Response		
	Agree	No Opin.	Disagree
The central administration is supportive of my program.	70.8	10.3	18.9
The building level administration is supportive of my program.	87.5	2.7	9.7
Non-music teachers in my building(s) are supportive of the music program.	79.2	5.6	15.3
I believe that the overall level of support for my program is high.	76	6	18
Parent-community support of my program is high.	72.3	9.4	18.3

The next set of questions was concerned with discipline, i.e., student conduct, and was reflected in three questions, numbers 6, 15, and 26:

Question	Response		
	Agree	No Opin.	Disagree
My university training prepared me for dealing with discipline problems.	21.5	5.7	72.7
Discipline is a major problem in my classroom(s).	23.5	4.5	72
My building administration supports me in dealing with discipline problems.	85.5	3.8	10.7

As in the case of the future of music education discussed above, a decision was made to analyze the first two of the previous questions regarding discipline in that this subject seems to be one of the more critical issues in so far as music teachers are concerned. Subgroups used were the same as in the earlier set of questions: urban, suburban, and rural teachers, and, 1-5 year, 6-10, 11-20, and 21 plus year teachers. Probability coefficients are provided where applicable beyond the .90 level. Finally, reliability was computed at .67. A graphic analysis of the foregoing follows in TABLE XI.

TABLE XI

POSITIVE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING DISCIPLINE AS IT AFFECTS MUSIC TEACHERS

Percentage figures of positive response

Questions	Total sample	Urban	Suburban	Rural	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-20 years	21+ years
My university training prepared me for dealing with discipline problems.	23	22.5	23.7	21	25	19.8	19.4	29.8
						p=.99		
Discipline is a major problem in my classroom(s).	25	34	20	26	33	21	22	23.4
			p=1.00			p=.98		

The fourth series of survey questions was concerned with financial support of music programs and teachers, and included questions numbered 5, 9, 11, 20, and 24; they are reported as follow:

Question	Response		
	Agree	No Opin.	Disagree
The financial support of my program has been improving in recent years.	34.3%	17.2%	48.5%
To operate my program successfully, I must raise money to augment district allocation.	54.7	15.6	29.7
Financial cutbacks have affected my music program.	54	13.5	32.5
Financial cutbacks in my school district will severely affect the music program in the future.	61	16.5	22.5
My position seems to be in jeopardy due to financial problems in my district.	24	17.6	58.4

The fifth series of survey questions pertained to the teaching of handicapped students in music classes; four questions were involved, numbers 13, 18, 19, and 22:

Question	Response		
	Agree	No Opin.	Disagree
Handicapped children should be in my music classes.	54.7%	23.2%	22.1%
I would prefer to teach handicapped students homogeneously grouped rather than "mainstreamed".	45	29.2	25.7
Handicapped children are included in my program.	57.7	21.5	20.7
My university training prepared me to teach handicapped students.	8	7.7	84.3

Two questions in the survey were concerned with integration in the schools; the questions involved are numbers 3 and 10, as follow:

Question	Response		
	Agree	No Opin.	Disagree
My university training prepared me to teach in an integrated setting.	41.8%	18.6%	39.6%
My district has undergone desegregation within the past five years.	16.1	42.4	41.4

Two areas of concern to the committee preparing the survey instrument were represented by only one question each. The first of these was concerned with the use of an approved course of study, question number 16; it follows:

Question	Response		
	Agree	No Opin.	Disagree
I feel pressured by supervisor/administrator to operate within the guidelines of an approved course of study.	8.4%	15.1%	76.5%

The final area of concern pertained to the Comprehensive Program in the Arts, question number 23; results for this question follow:

Question	Response		
	Agree	No Opin.	Disagree
I view the Comprehensive Program in the Arts as a significant opportunity for music education in Ohio.	43.3%	48.7%	7.9%

The final section of the survey of music teachers consisted of four statements requesting opinions in a non-categorized manner. Two of the statements requested asked for positive and negative aspects regarding the respondents' perception of the profession, the third requested any manner by which the OMEA might aid in school district problems, and the fourth asked for general comment regarding anything in the questionnaire.

It should be noted that approximately 1500 respondents provided at lease one comment to at least one of the four statements. Because of the complex nature of handling such a voluminous amount of raw data by hand, the researcher cannot attest to precise figures for these questions; all tallies should be within one percent of complete accuracy.

An examination of the last issue first revealed that comments on questionnaire items were few, in comparison to all other response in the study, and were centered around four primary statements: 1) the researchers were assailed for failing to identify properly the area of handicapped students in earlier questions, 2) there was confusion regarding the budget questions, 3) the survey is worthless, and 4) the survey is excellent. Although no specific tally was made, there were approximately fifty responses for the first two items noted, twenty-five for number three, and about one-hundred for number four. There was one additional area of comment, in which a number of respondents, circa. fifty, elaborated primarily on positive and negative issues which were obviously of prime concern in their minds, although only indirectly related to the specific nature of the survey. Several asked us to help them find new jobs, several asked that we aid their school district in rejuvenating a worn music program, and several offered various panaceas for the solution to serious problems in music education in Ohio; many of these were well-prepared documents completed in highly intellectual style and with a wisdom developed through years of observation.

The next statement discussed here regards the listing of "outstanding positive aspects which serve to encourage you in your profession." There were approximately 1300 comments, and, although there was a number of unique comments, the vast majority were able to be assigned to one of sixteen categories listed in TABLE XII below in rank percentage order.

TABLE XII

POSITIVE ASPECTS OF ENCOURAGEMENT
IN THE MUSIC TEACHING PROFESSION

Positive Comment	Percent
Interest and attitude of students	21.0%
Achievement of students	19.0
Public/parent support	8.0
Administrative support	7.4
Support of colleagues	6.4
Orff/Kodály workshops	6.3
Miscellaneous workshops	5.3
Joy of music	5.5
Pride in work	4.0
Wealth of materials	3.2
Fringe benefits: vacations, insurance, retirement	2.5
Teaching the handicapped	2.0
Superior performances	2.0
Breadth of program	2.0
Continual challenge	1.0
Desirable schedule	1.0
Miscellaneous	3.3
	100.0%

N = 1300 ±

The next statement was concerned with the listing of "some outstanding negative aspects which often discourage you in your profession." There was a total of approximately 2200 responses to this statement, the majority of which were fitted into eighteen categories which identify the areas of concern, in some cases in a rather comprehensive manner. The negative response is listed below in TABLE XIII, again in rank percentage order.

TABLE XIII

NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF DISCOURAGEMENT
IN THE MUSIC TEACHING PROFESSION

Negative comment	Percent
Discipline problems	12.4%
Lack of dollars: detracting from programs, cutbacks in program	10.5
Lack of administrative support/lack of administrative competence in music concerns	8.6
Lack of public/parent support	8.1
Student apathy	8.1
Salary inadequate	6.7
Unhealthy competition with athletic programs	5.7
General lack of prestige for music	4.8
Scheduling problems	4.8
Lack of dollars: losing teachers	3.8
Teacher "burn out"	3.8
Lack of adequate facilities	3.8
No planning time during school day	3.8
Working with disinterested, incompetent colleagues	3.3
Lack of teacher support	3.3
Supplemental salary not commensurate with added responsibilities	2.9
Too much emphasis on OMEA competitive events	1.4
Fund raising difficulties	1.4
Miscellaneous	2.8
	100.0%

N = 2200 ±

Finally, the teacher survey requested that respondents list methods "by which the OMEA might be able to help you solve problems in your music program." There was a total of approximately 1200 responses to this request, and, the responses were significantly more varied than in either of the two previous statements, requiring a total of twenty-five discrete categories to accomodate all the response. There were, however, four categories in which commonality was sufficiently large so as to encompass greater than forty percent of the total response as will be noted in TABLE XIV below.

TABLE XIV

REQUESTS FOR OMEA HELP
FOR SCHOOL MUSIC PROGRAMS

Teacher Requests	Percent
Lobby in Ohio Legislature for additional/ adequate dollars for education	12.0%
Lobby in Ohio Legislature for the preservation of music in Ohio schools/ value, enforce standards, courses of study-curriculum guide enforcement	12.0
Spread the word-the value of music-to school administrators	11.0
Conduct workshops throughout the state, esp. elem-midd school and discipline better	9.0
Create District, Region, State public relations (good press) for music-OMEA activities	5.0
Prepare a pamphlet(s) for school districts/ teachers - the value of music	5.0
This survey excellent idea - use the results	5.0
Stop contests and everything else OMEA doing - solve problems noted in survey	4.0
Hire a field representative - provide useful advice to schools - dollars, programs, schedules, staff	4.0
Do away with marching band contest	4.0
Add guitar, show choir, composition to contests	3.3
OMEA has no sympathy/empathy for small rural school	3.3
Expand good ideas in TRIAD, esp. as relates to model programs and elem. music	3.3

TABLE XIV

(Continued)

Wish to know how to join OMEA	3.3%
OMEA state conference good	3.3
OMEA state conference needs more elem. clinics that are worthwhile	2.5
University professors need to get out of offices and help in the field	2.5
OMEA is a useless organization	2.0
Need a monthly OMEA newsletter with real issues	2.0
Need better and consistent judging in contests	2.0
Provide annual music department evaluations to illustrate problems	1.0
Provide foundation grant information	1.0
Help eliminate junior high school music requirements	1.0
Help eliminate PL 94-142 in Ohio	1.0
Miscellaneous	1.0
	100.0%

N = 1200 ±

SECTION II, SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY

A. Factual Data

Of the 301 responses to the school district survey, 57% came from local schools, 31% from city schools, and 11% came from exempted villages, again, as in the teacher survey, a response which closely parallels the state-wide distribution for school districts.[11] Viewing the response from a slightly different perspective, 53% came from rural districts, 35% from suburban schools, and about 12% came from urban school districts. This response is reasonably disparate from that of the teacher survey in that urban representation dropped from twenty-four to twelve percent while rural response increased by more than twenty percentage points (from 32 to 53%); suburban representation dropped by about seven percent. All counties in Ohio were represented in the survey, ranging from one response in a number of rural counties to eighteen in Cuyahoga County, the most populous.

Schools responding represented student populations ranging from some of the largest in the state to some of the smallest.[12] The largest high school reported was 20,600 students, the smallest, 120 students; the greatest number of junior high students was 15,500, while the least number reported was 48; finally, the largest elementary system reported 33,100 students, while the smallest was 120. There was a rather constant progression of size for high schools from 120 through 3300; beyond that there were six districts reporting students in excess of 5000. The most common figure reported for high school size was 800. For junior high schools the smooth continuum was also apparent from 48 through 2400; beyond that figure, there were 7 districts above 3000. The mode for junior high school size was 400. Finally, for elementary schools the student population increment progressed smoothly from 120 students through 5100; there were ten districts reporting student populations in excess of 5600. The mode for elementary school size was 1200 students.

Seventy-five percent of the districts reporting indicated a decrease in student population within the past five years. Conversely, only twelve percent indicated an increase in population, while the remaining thirteen percent have had no change.

---

[11] For a listing of all the schools in the study according to student enrollment and number of each see TABLE XV, page 25.

In view of the quite small percentage of no response on the various questions in the school district survey (Mean of approximately 3%), it was surprising that in two areas of questions, money and teachers, nearly one-fourth failed to respond. However, for the districts which did respond, there was a total of 2321 teachers counted. Of this number the following percentages of representation were determined: general teachers, 35%; choral teachers, 28%; instrumental teachers, 36%. Viewing the representation from a different perspective: 28% were high school teachers, 30% junior high school teachers, and 42% were elementary teachers.

As to the question concerned with the teaching of music by specialists in elementary schools, all respondents indicated that music is taught by specialists in all grades, one through eight; there was no negative response, only "no response."

As a possible survey design error it should be noted that, while districts were asked if all music was taught by specialists in all grades (and received affirmative response), we failed to ask the question, "is music taught in the various grades." Interpolating from the raw data of "no response" to the questions regarding specialists teaching music, it was found that the percentage of "no response" was a continuum ranging from a high of nearly 10% for grade one to a low of approximately 5% for grade six. On the basis of such response it may be inferred that a number of schools are not teaching music at all in some grades, and, that the teaching of music expands as the grade level increases. Finally, only two schools reported that music in kindergarten is taught by music specialists.

In an attempt to simplify and clarify the data from the school district survey, the following questions are listed in question and answer form. Percentages of "no response", with two notable exceptions, were quite low, the mean being approximately 1.5%. Responses are given as percentage figures, as follow:

	YES	NO
Are music teachers paid salary increments for duties beyond classroom teaching?	88%	12%
Does your district have annual evaluations of all music teachers?	83	17
Does your District have a Board of Education-approved course of study for music?	85	15

	YES	NO
Has the approved course of study been revised within the past five years?	78	22
Are high school music courses, including performance organizations, scheduled during the normal school day?	96	4
Do any high school performance organizations make performance trips other than for football games and music contests?	84	16
Is there a budget of Board of Education funds for all music programs in your district?	75	25
If there is no budget of Board funds, please explain.	no response	
Are there music booster organizations in your district?	98	2
Are the booster organizations active?	99	1
Do the booster organizations provide funds for music programs?	96	4
Are funds for music programs adequate?	61	39
If funds are inadequate, please explain.	no response	
Does your school district have a supervisor of music?	26	74
If you have a supervisor, does that person hold also a teaching position?	72	28

In regard to the issue of supervision, only about one-fourth of the representative school districts have music supervisors, and, of that group nearly three-fourths have also a teaching position; it would seem that there are a relative few full time music supervisors in the state. Of those who do also teach, it was reported that about 50% are in general music, 25% band directors, 17% high school choral directors, and the remaining 8% various other teaching areas.

It will be remembered by the reader that 99% of the respondent school districts reported an active booster organization, and, that 96% of those provide monies for music programs; these figures include less than one percent "no response." However, in terms of the amounts of booster monies provided, greater than 49% failed to respond, making any meaningful analysis somewhat suspect. Nevertheless, monies reported ranged from a low of $1.00 noted by four school districts to a high of $100,000 reported by one district. The mode was $2000 reported by twenty school districts, however, seventy-five districts reported booster monies in excess of $5000.

The total dollar amount of Board of Education monies allocated for music programs during the 1980-81 school year received response from nearly all schools, i.e. 295. Allocations ranged from a low of $150 to a high of $1,688,700. Disregarding the size of the school district, 61% of all schools reporting allocated $2500 or less for music, and 81% allocated $10,000 or less for music programs. TABLE XV below indicates board of education dollar allocations according to school size. Dollars spent per pupil is not absolute due to the grouping of data, however, the range in this area is from a probable low of $.10 per student to a high of $400.00. Due to the possibility of misleading the reader, responses within each category in TABLE XV have not been reported as percentages, but rather in terms of actual numbers. For the reader who wishes to know the particular percentage of his school's dollar allocation for music in relation to other schools of the same size, the number in any given category divided by the total number of schools in the same category will produce the correct percentage placement. The percentage of a school district's total budget allocated to music programs was a figure most likely unknown to most respondents in that nearly two-thirds failed to complete this particular question. For those who did respond, nearly 35% reported that one percent was allocated for music; the next most frequent percentages given were two and five, with about 8.5% reporting each. For this question there were several highly suspect responses including one district which reported that 99% of the budget was expended for music!

TABLE XV

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND BOARD OF EDUCATION DOLLARS
ALLOCATED FOR MUSIC PROGRAMS, 1980-81

Student enrollment	Dollars allocated $1 - 2500	to 5000	to 7500	to 10,000	to 15,000	to 20,000	to 30,000	to 40,000	to 50,000
1-500	49	11	2	1	2	2	1	2	0
501-1000	65	7	6	2	0	0	0	0	1
1001-1500	33	6	4	5	3	0	0	0	1
1501-2000	11	6	2	3	2	2	0	1	0
2001-2500	9	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0
2501-3000	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
3001-3500	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
3501-4000	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0
4001-4500	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
4501-5000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5001-6000	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
6001-7000*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
8,000-9000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9,001-10,000	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
10,001-20,000	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
20,001-30,000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30,001-40,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	to 60,000	to 80,000	to 100,000	to 200,000	to 300,000	to 500,000	More than 500,000	Number of schools
1-500	2	0	1	4	0	0	0	77
501-1000	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	83
1001-1500	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	53
1501-2000	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	29
2001-2500	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	16
2501-3000	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	8
3001-3500	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	8
3501-4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
4001-4500	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
4501-5000	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
5001-6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
6001-7000*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
8000-9000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9001-10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
10,001-20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
20,001-30,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
30,001-40,000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

* No schools reported student enrollment between 7,000 and 8,000.

N = 295

Regarding the issue of music teachers who have left a school district within the past five years, fourteen schools failed to report (4.6%), 49 reported the loss of no teachers within the past five years, while 238 schools reported the loss of at least one teacher during the particular time period. The total number of teachers lost was reported at 788; the Mode was 2 (71 schools); the Mean was 3.3, although the Mean was skewed toward the high side because of two schools which reported the loss of 35 and 50 teachers respectively. Perhaps a more meaningful statistic is that greater than 95% of the schools reported a loss of six or fewer teachers.

Of the 788 teachers reported lost to school districts within the past five years, reasons were provided for approximately 73% (574). Some reasons given were somewhat ambiguous, however, for purposes of this study each one has been assigned a place in one of fifteen categories as noted below in TABLE IX. All figures given are percentages of the total for which reasons for leaving were provided by the school.

TABLE XVI

OMEA SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY
REASONS FOR TEACHER LOSS IN THE YEARS, 1976-1981

Reason Given	Percentage
Promotion	3.3%
Contract not renewed (fired)	10.5
Health problem	2.4
New career (not music)	11.5
Moved from area	10.3
Maternity	6.3
Different teaching job in music (better job)	12.5
Retired	10.6
Job attrition (program cutback)	6.0
Job conflicts	2.3
Salary inadequate	3.8
Workload inordinate	1.4
Marriage	3.5
Graduate school	6.1
Personal (no identifiable reason)	9.6
N = 574	100.0%

The next factual statistic available pertains to the number of units of high school music offered by the various respondent school districts. The range is from zero to eighteen, the mode is two with three very close (24% and 22% respectively), and 75% offer five or fewer courses. Both extremes of range may well seem strange when one notes that four schools reported the offering of no courses in music, one professed to offer eighteen, while four others reported the offering of more than fifteen.

Finally, the question was asked, "What professional position is held by the person responding to the questionnaire?" Nearly all respondents complied with the result that nearly 81% were administrators, including principals, assistant superintendents, curriculum directors, supervisors, and, in one case, a secretary. Two-thirds of the remaining responses were provided by high school band directors, the remainder by various other music teachers.

B. Opinions

At this point there remains only the section of the school district questionnaire which requested opinions pertaining to various aspects of support and quality of music programs. An average of less than one percent failed to respond to this section. In the interest of brevity and clarity the particular section of the questionnaire is reprinted in its entirety with percentage figures inserted for each category of response. The questions and results are as follow:

Check the response which most closely reflects your judgment.	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
1. The level of active support for elementary music by classroom teachers.	33[1]	40	21	4	1
2. The level of active support for elementary music by administration.	44	39	13	2	1
3. Level of active support for junior high (middle) school music by classroom teachers.	22	44	25	6	3
4. Level of active support for junior high (middle) school music by administration.	45	40	11	4	0
5. Level of active support for high school music by classroom teachers.	18	33	40	7	2
6. Level of active support for high school music by administration.	46	40	12	1	1
7. Level of active support for music (high school) by students outside the music program.	11	31	37	14	6
8. Level of active support for all music programs by community.	32	43	19	3	2
9. Please assess the components of your music program as follows:					
elementary music	34	46	14	4	2
junior high (middle) general music	25	41	23	7	4
elementary instrumental	32	45	18	3	2
junior high (middle) instrumental	35	45	16	3	1
high school choral	38	32	17	9	4
high school instrumental	49	38	10	3	0

[1] All figures given are percentages; they are given in whole numbers, and may not equal 100 percent in all cases due to the rounding of numbers.

Finally, the school district survey included two questions intended for open-ended response, which, unfortunately, was very limited; fewer than 15% of the completed surveys included any response to the two questions. The first question asked for a statement of major concerns of music programs, while the second asked if the OMEA might do anything to aid the music program. Again, response was most limited, however, music teachers were the target of most concerns. Response included three common themes: 1) disinterested/incompetent music teachers, 2) insistence upon inordinate amounts of time for music classes in elementary schools, especially instrumental music, and 3) music teachers' unwillingness to participate in any extra-school activity without financial compensation. Also noted on many responses is the lack of money to maintain an adequate program. Most notable among the opinions concerning OMEA aid to a program were the following: 1) simplify OMEA contest procedures and travel necessities, 2) convince the legislature/Department of Education to put "teeth" into the mandate for the teaching of music, and 3) press for the teaching of music rather than the unified arts approach. Also noted by several was the hope that the OMEA would press for specialization in teaching certificates rather than the current comprehensive K-12 teaching certificate, and finally, that the OMEA would convince the Legislature that optimum programs cannot be maintained without adequate dollars.

SECTION III. CONCLUSIONS

Summary conclusions of this study are based on interpretations of certain sections of the report which appear to need final emphasis and clarification. Within the study there are, of course, many conclusions which could be drawn, however, in an effort to be brief, a number of obvious conclusions are excluded; they are left to the reader's interpretation. No priority order is intended for the conclusions which follow:

1) Although the return from the music teacher survey was only 47.5% of the total number of potential returns, we have a legitimate sample in that we contacted the total population as opposed to having the study use a selected sample of the possible clientele. The same fact holds true for the school district study which had a 49% return.

2) In an attempt to interpolate data regarding the net loss of music teachers in school districts during the past five years, we found that we failed to ask one important question of the districts, namely, whether or not a teacher who left for any given reason was replaced. However, there are several facts of the issue which can be cited: 1) there were 171 school districts which reported a net loss of teachers, there were 116 which reported a net gain of teachers, and there were 266 which reported no change in the numbers of teachers during the period of study, 2) three-fourths of the school districts (the total reporting this issue) reported the loss of 788 teachers; of this number, reasons were given for 574, of which six percent were reported lost through job attrition. On the basis of these figures one could conclude, with a certain amount of conjecture, that approximately 2100 teachers have been lost in school districts in the past five years, and that approximately 126 of them have not been replaced; these figures may be misleading because they assume that in all other categories of teacher loss the teacher was replaced, 3) in examining sources outside this survey, namely, The OMEA Directory, it was found that the number of music teachers listed in the Directory has increased by approximately 4% during each of the past three years; this, of course, could be the result of better reporting, however, even if all the increase is accredited to more accurate reporting of teachers, it is likely that we have lost a relatively small proportion of teacher positions in Ohio schools during the past several years.

3) Of the 788 teachers leaving school districts, two reasons were given in the survey which should attract special attention, namely, that of contract non-renewal and that of leaving the profession for a new career. Greater than 20% of all reasons given were in these two areas, a figure which seems alarming. Presuming that most teachers were released from their positions because of incompetence or failure to establish reasonable rapport with administrators, this statistic may well be a way of informing universities that more viable methods of accepting teacher candidates be instituted. Conversely, for those who are leaving the profession for other careers, it is likely true that a number do so because they see

themselves as not destined to become successful teachers, and, it is also undoubtedly true that many see more attractive opportunities in other fields.

4) With a comparison of both surveys regarding the issue of support for music programs, there are a number of conclusions which can be made. Although response options were constructed differently in this area due to the differing nature of questions in each survey, by interpolation one can derive four conclusions: 1) that administrators perceive their support of music programs at a higher level than do music teachers, although there is a distinct difference in level of support by central administration and by building administration according to teachers (the building administration is much more supportive), 2) support of classroom teachers is perceived at about the same level by both teachers and administration, although the level of support by classroom teachers drops sharply for high school programs from that of elementary programs, 3) administrators apparently perceive a rather significantly higher level of support by the community than do the teachers, and 4) support for high school music did not receive a particularly positive response from administrators.

Examining the open-ended response of the teacher survey, one will see approximately equal percentages of positive and negative comments regarding support, although there were about 60% more negative responses than positive. Perhaps one could conclude that these generally low levels of support are the result of teacher apathy to the program, to students, to the public, and to teachers' failure to establish an acceptable level of rapport in public and internal relations; perhaps also it is the teacher's inability to provide the necessary leadership for a truly successful program. On the other hand, it may be that the negative ethos unhappily saddled on the system of education in today's society is reflected in these percentages. In any event it would seem that internal and external support for music programs should be evidenced by overwhelming majorities in all cases at all levels.

5) School district response in terms of an assessment of the quality of the various programs indicates that administrators apparently perceive instrumental music programs to be of higher quality than either general or choral music. At the high school level 87% indicated that instrumental music is either "excellent" or "good" while only 70% made the same responses for choral music. Junior high school general music received the lowest composite rating in that only 66% rated in the two categories noted above; conversely, however, elementary music programs received an 80% response of "excellent" and "good;" elementary and junior high instrumental programs were very close to the elementary percentage. As these perceptions of quality come, largely, from school administrators rather than from musicians, one might question if they are truly qualitative assessments, or, if they may be, rather, assessments of relative success. In either case the point is that these assessments reflect perceptions which are probably held by the general public concerning the relative merits of our music programs. One further

observation is warranted; it is that the assessment of quality of music programs is generally high as indicated by the relatively small percentages of response in the categories of "fair" and "poor." Depending on how these assessments may compare to like assessments in other fields of study, administrative opinions of music may, indeed, be rather high.

6) The teacher survey questions regarding the issue of the "goodness of" and the future of the profession reveal a number of statistics, some encouraging and some of real concern for the profession. First, the one greatly encouraging statistic was that nearly 95% of the sample believes that music is a basic compoment of the school curriculum. Second, 89% indicated that the teaching of music is a fulfilling profession. Third, there were four remaining questions within this genre for which responses indicate some real concerns for the profession. In that the reliability coefficient was computed at .77, it is likely that the responses indicate true opinions of the great majority of respondents rather than being the result of some random response. Consider the following: 1) while approximately two-thirds of the sample seems to be encouraged about the future of a given music program, only about one-third is encouraged about music in Ohio schools, 2) although nearly 90% indicated that music is a fulfilling profession, nearly 36% indicated that they are considering leaving the profession (as a nearly-direct corollary 65% indicated that they would choose the profession if beginning again today,) and 3) considering that these statistics come from the analysis in which the "no opinion" category was deleted, the figures are even more disquieting when one examines the other table in which substantial numbers of respondents registered "no opinion" regarding these issues. Finally, urban teachers and all teachers of from six to ten years experience tend to be somewhat less encouraged about music than do all other music teachers.

Although in these days of dwindling college enrollments, colleges and universities may take heart in the potential drop-out rate of teachers as it may affect future teacher employment, certainly the possible loss of more than one-third of our profession in Ohio has to be an alarming issue. Even though it does seem alarming that the music teaching profession has a large percentage of potential "drop outs," it can be argued that, in relation to other learned professions, a high percentage rate of loss is a common fact of contemporary society, particularly among the younger members of a given profession. On the basis of the facts available in this study, it would seem that the perennial problem of salary in education is not the most important issue involved. An examination of the table of negative responses, i.e., reasons for discouragement in the profession, reveals that nearly half of all the negative comments involved five particular areas: discipline, lack of money for program, administrative support, public support, and student apathy; salary was the sixth-ranked negative comment. This does not signify that the teacher-respondents in this study are supportive of the current level of teacher salaries in Ohio schools, but it does seem to indicate that there are a number of issues, in addition to salary, which are probably causing Ohio teachers to leave the profession.

7) Perhaps the most important conclusion regarding the issue of discipline is that colleges and universities are inadequately preparing students for discipline problems in the classroom in that only 25% of the first-five year teachers noted that they had been prepared for such problems, while 33% of the same group indicated that they have major problems in this area. Unfortunately, no table is available which shows discipline problems as they might affect teaching in the various areas of music.

8) As pertains the issue of handicapped children in music programs, it seemed unusual that more than 20% of the sample apparently do not know if they have such children. With no knowledge of the possible numbers of handicapped children in Ohio schools, it would seem, nonetheless, that there must be a greater number of handicapped students in schools than are acknowledged in the responses of this survey. Especially in view of the ramifications of PL 94-142 it seems strange that only 60% of the respondents are working with handicapped children.

9) Regarding the issue of board of education dollars allocated for music programs, several important findings require some emphasis. TABLE XV, supra, is admittedly, an unwieldy table, but the intention was to picture, as comprehensively as possible, dollars for music in relation to student enrollment. TABLE XV shows that more than 60% of the school districts, regardless of size, provided $2500 or fewer dollars in 1980-81. If a school has 500 students, this would represent an expenditure of $5.00 per student; if 2500, the allocation is $1.00; if 28,000 (as one school in the study), the allocation is $.08 per student. No data is available which would indicate optimum sums of money necessary for successful music programs, however, even $5.00 per student would be a minimal ratio in most school districts. Further, it is probable that student enrollment and dollars allocated should work in inverse order, i.e., the smaller the school the larger the per student expenditure, for the reason that, when one considers the cost of many items purchased for a music program, the size of the school has no relation to the cost of the item. Certainly, as will be seen in the table, there are a few school districts which probably provided an inordinate amount of dollars for music during the past year; for example, four schools provided about $400.00 per student. Nonetheless, the fact remains that 60% of the schools represented provided very meager dollars for their programs, and 81% allocated $10,000 or fewer dollars for music programs. It seems very probable that school districts have failed to provide adequate dollars for program as has been charged by teacher respondents in the survey.

Presently the State of Ohio has, seemingly, declared virtual bankruptcy leaving to the educational system the task of recovering for the State treasury nearly 80% of the projected loss for the current biennium. However, whatever the plight of monies in Ohio, there will be dollars spent for education in the future, and these dollars should be spent in a manner in which music programs receive equitable monetary treatment in relation to the various other disciplines and activies in schools.

10) Requests and suggestions from teachers to the OMEA were many and varied. However, of the nearly 1200 suggestions, it was somewhat surprising to find that 24% involved requests for the OMEA to become a political force in Columbus for the purpose of lobbying the Ohio Legislature for adequate dollars for education and for the preservation of music in Ohio schools. Of course, this is not a mandate for the OMEA, however, it does indicate a rather substantial belief of purpose, and should receive honest deliberation from the Association. Apparently in response to a substantial number of comments from teachers regarding the failure of school administrators to support music programs, the next most-frequent comment to the OMEA was that the Association "spread the word concerning the value of music" to school administrators; actually, nearly 25% of all the comments pertain to achieving "better press" for music if one considers the several different headings within this general theme. Finally, many of the suggestions have merit, and should receive careful examination by the OMEA. Obviously, in terms of resources available, the OMEA could not implement all suggestions at any given time; on a priority basis, however, a number of the suggestions may well lead to viable, maybe unique, ventures for the Association.

11) To conclude this report on the most promising data available in the study, a look at positive aspects reported by teachers is in order. Thus, it is truly encouraging to note that 40%, approximately 525 of the teachers reporting, commented that student interest, attitude, and achievement are the most encouraging aspects of the profession. Indeed, in spite of negative statistics and some words of discouragement, the real raison d'etre of our profession continues!

Hopefully, the results of this study will prove useful as an aid toward the understanding and the enrichment of music in Ohio schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

OMEA MUSIC TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

School district--city, exempted village, local, Christian, parochial, private County_____

Type of community--urban, suburban, rural Your highest degree_____ Years of teaching experience_____

Level of teaching--Elem., Middle, JHS, HS Area of specialization_____

Teach in how many school buildings_____ Number of classes per week_____ Total number of students per week_____

General music teachers: average class size_____; daily planning time _____minutes

Performance group teachers: in past five years--

number of groups increased_____; decreased_____; no change_____; don't know_____
size of groups increased_____; decreased_____; no change_____; don't know_____

Total school district enrollment in past five years: increased____, decreased____, no change____, don't know_____

Total number of school district music teachers in past five years: increased_____, decreased_____, no change_____, don't know_____.

Annual music budget provided by the board in your school(s): 1_____, 2_____, 3_____, don't know____

Has budget increased_____ or decreased_____ in past five years; no change_____, don't know_____

Is there a music boosters organization in your school district?_____ Is your budget adequate?_____

How many dollars have been provided for your program from the booster organization during the present year?_____

Do you utilize a board of education-approved course of study in the planning and teaching of your classes?_____

Were you involved in the development of an approved course of study for your program?_____

Is there a board of education-approved course of study for music in your school district?_____

Is there an ESP (educational service personnal) program in your school?_____; don't know_____

Are you a member of the OMEA?_____ Are all music classes in district taught by music specialists?_____

Check the response which most closely reflects your knowledge or opinion.

	Agree strongly	Agree generally	No opinion; N/A	Disagree generally	Disagree strongly
1. I believe that music is as basic to general education as the "three r's."					
2. The "building level" administration is supportive of my music program.					
3. My university training prepared me to teach in an integrated setting.					
4. I am considering leaving the profession of music education.					
5. To operate my program successfully, I must raise money to augment district allocation.					
6. My university training prepared me for dealing with discipline problems.					
7. I am encouraged about the future of music education in Ohio schools.					
8. I am encouraged about the future of my music program.					
9. The financial support of my program has been improving in recent years.					
10. My district has undergone desegregation within the past five years.					
11. My position seems to be in jeopardy due to financial problems in my district.					

	Agree strongly	Agree generally	No opinion; N/A	Disagree generally	Disagree strongly
12. Non-music teachers in my building(s) are supportive of the music program.					
13. Handicapped children should be in my music classes.					
14. I believe that the overall level of support for my program is high.					
15. Discipline is a major problem in my classroom(s).					
16. I feel pressured by supervisor/administrator to operate within the guidelines of an approved course of study.					
17. Parent-community support of my program is high.					
18. I would prefer to teach handicapped students homogeneously grouped rather than "mainstreamed."					
19. Handicapped children are included in my music program.					
20. Financial cutbacks have affected my music program.					
21. The "central" administration is supportive of my program.					
22. My university training prepared me to teach handicapped students.					
23. I view the Comprehensive Program in the Arts as a significant opportunity for music education in Ohio.					
24. Financial cutbacks in my school district will severely affect the music program in the future.					
25. Teaching music is a fulfilling profession for me.					
26. My building administration supports me in dealing with discipline problems.					
27. If I were choosing a profession again today, I would still choose to become a music teacher.					

Please list in rank order some outstanding positive aspects which serve to encourage you in your profession.

Please list in rank order some outstanding negative aspects which often discourage you in your profession.

Please list any methods by which the OMEA might be able to help you solve problems in your music program.

Please comment on any specific item(s) in this questionnaire.

OMEA SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY

APPENDIX B

1. Type of school district — city, exempted village, local

2. County_____

3. Type of community — urban, suburban, rural

4. Number of students: high school_____, Jr. High (middle)_____, elementary_____

5. Has district—increased, decreased, no change—in student numbers in past five years?

6. Number of music teachers in district:
   general music_____ high school_____
   choral music_____ Jr. High (middle)_____
   instrumental music_____ elementary_____

7. In what grades is classroom music taught by music specialists? K,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8

8. Are music teachers paid salary increments for duties beyond classroom teaching?_____

   If yes, for what duties are they paid?_____

9. Does your district have annual evaluations of all music teachers?_____

10. Does your district have a Board of Education-approved course of study for music?_____

    If yes, has it been revised within the past five years?_____

11. How many music teachers have left your school district in the past five years?_____

    List as many individual reasons as possible._____

    _____

12. How many units of high school music are offered?_____

13. Are high school music courses, including performance organizations, scheduled during the normal school day?_____

14. Do any high school performance organizations make performance trips other than for football games and music contests?_____

15. Is there a budget of Board of Education funds for all music programs in your district?_____

    If no, please explain._____

16. Are there music booster organizations in your district?_____

    If yes, are they active?_____

    Do they provide funds for music programs?_____

    If yes, how much for the current year?_____

17. Are funds for music programs adequate?_____

    If no, please explain._____

18. For the current school year, what are the total Board of Education monies available for music programs?_____

19. For the current year, what percentage of the total educational budget is allocated to music programs?_____

20. Does your school district have a supervisor of music?_____

    If yes, does the supervisor also hold a teaching position?_____

    If yes, what is the teaching position?_____

21. What is the professional position of the person responding to this questionnaire?

    _____

Check the response which most closely reflects your judgment.	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
1. The level of active support for elementary music by classroom teachers.					
2. The level of active support for elementary music by administration.					
3. Level of active support for junior high (middle) school music by classroom teachers.					
4. Level of active support for junior high (middle) school music by administration.					
5. Level of active support for high school music by classroom teachers.					
6. Level of active support for high school music by administration.					
7. Level of active support for music (high school) by students outside the music program.					
8. Level of active support for all music programs by community.					
9. Please assess the components of your music program as follows:					
elementary music					
junior high (middle) general music					
elementary instrumental					
junior high (middle) instrumental					
high school choral					
high school instrumental					

Please respond to the following:

What, if any, are the major concerns you have concerning music programs in your school district?

Is there anything the OMEA might do to help the music program in your district? If yes, please specify.

APPENDIX C

OMEA TEACHER SURVEY
PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE BY
OMEA DISTRICT AND REGION

District	Percent
1	7.5%
2	5.4
3	5.6
4	2.9
5	1.3
6	12.6
7	10.4
8	7.0
9	2.2
10	5.7
11	3.1
12	9.0
13	5.6
14	9.7
15	8.0
16	2.0
17	2.0
	100.0%

Region	Percent
Northwest	18.5%
Southwest	27.4
Southcentral	12.0
Northeast	27.2
Eastcentral	14.9
	100.0%

N = 1831